DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 114 SP 026 872

AUTHOR Johnson, Donald
TITLE The Contribution of the Humanities to a Global Perspective in Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 22p.; Paper commissioned by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education for the Guidelines for International Teacher Education Project. For related documents, see SP 026 860-871 and SP 026 874.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Pluralism; Culture Conflict; *Global Approach; Higher Education; *Humanities Instruction; Non Western Civilization; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Social History; Western Civilization

ABSTRACT

In a discussion of the importance of involving study of the humanities in teacher education, it is pointed out that the concept of the humanities must be broadened to include the important civilizations which have flourished outside of Western culture. The history of the rise of the Global Education Movement is traced, and the differing approaches to studying and understanding unfamiliar cultures are analyzed. It is suggested that while the humanities offer the greatest potential for studying cultural particularism, it is ironic that the humanities as they are now constituted are one of the most culture-bound and parochial domains of western knowledge, and, as they are now taught, increase the parochialism and western ethnocentricism of the students who study them. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE HUMANITIES

To A Global Perspective in Teacher Education

ED265114

Prepared as a working paper
for the
Guidelines for
International Teacher Education Project of AACTE

Donald Johnson
New York University
March, 1985 .

SP 026 872

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Img

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

If we wish to involve the humanities in fostering a global perspective, we must first take the humanities seriously in general as an important field of study in teacher education and then broaden the concept of the humanities to include the important civilizations which have flourished outside Western culture. At present we are doing neither. Two recent, major national studies point to the woeful status of the humanities in both secondary and higher education. (1) If the humanities in high schools and colleges is in a state of crisis, the plight of the humanities in teacher education is even worse. Perspective teachers are not required to study the humanities of western civilization in any serious way, and we offer them almost nothing about the humanistic tradition of the great civilizations outside the west.

Count the number of faculty members and compare the size of departments in most teacher education colleges and one usually discovers large departments of Psychology and Administration; one seldom finds a significant number of offerings in anthropology or the humanities or in other disciplines which focus on the varying cultural traditions of the world. Psychology is almost always required for anyone in a teacher training program. Rigorous courses on culture and civilization as humanistic areas of study hardly exist in most teacher education colleges; even less frequently are they required areas of study.

The virtual absence of the humanities as an important subject in the education of American youth in general and in teacher training in particular has a a long history. To address the reasons for their absence, we must understand the historical ethos in which American education has grown and be cognizant of the present biases and modes of discourse within the profession itself.

The first so called "scientific" efforts to study other people seriously and professionally are only about a hundred years old. As the social sciences struggled to be born, history was influenced by the new cult of science. The fields of human analysis sought to emulate the natural sciences and tried to generate universal laws of human development and social change. Historians such as John Fiske and the first

anthropologists like Lewis Henry Morgan both agreed that the secret of human development was evolution and that every group passed through immutable stages of growth from savagery, to barbarism to civilization. To reach civilization a human group required advanced technology which the evolutionists assumed was the engine of human progress.

The evolutionary concept of social development was not a new idea. The idea of progress is almost as old as Western civilization itself. Since the 18th century European Enlightenment, the dominant western model has been the linear development of societies leading to ever higher planes of reason and social good. By the 1950's evolutionary assumptions had sprouted into modernization theory which again assumed that social change was inevitable and that some external law of human development automatically moved so called "traditional cultures" into higher stages of civilization. By the 1970's evolutionary growth theories had blossomed into the World Systems approach of Immanual Wallerstein. Wallerstein's basic premise was that, "A single capitalist world economy has been developing since the 16th century and its development has been the driving force of modern social change." (2)

A second major model for an analysis of the world used in American education grew mainly out of the traditions of British Liberal/Utilitarian philosophy of the early 19th century which found its major testing ground in Asia. Liberal/Utilitarian thought rested on the belief in rational man operating in a society composed of individuals, each pursuing his own happiness and avoiding pain. The Utilitarian believed human problems could be solved rationally through the sacred principle of law. A policy of "Just laws and light taxes" would usher in a society where poverty would be eliminated and earthly happiness could be embraced by all people regardless of race or culture. As good followers of Lockean psychology, the Utilitarians believed firmly in the possibility of education as a means of uplifting the benighted Asians and helping them overcome their superstitious ways. After 1835, the objective of education in India was to "...form a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect." (3)

Through education, the Liberal/Utilitarians believed, the obsolete and backward social and cultural systems of Asia could be eliminated and a glorious rational future would be possible for the multitudes. However, there were enemies of this rational education which had to be slain and these enemies were religious beliefs. If, the British reasoned, they could only put an end to Hinduism, Islam and Confucianism and the accretion of centuries of superstitious values, they could indeed build a sense of individualism, institute parliamentary democracy, rationalize the legal structure and promote a consuming society. This great progress could be accomplished in spite of the Asian people whom the liberals saw as:

> Nations [that] are, to nearly an equal degree, tainted with the vices of insincerity; dissembling, treacherous, mendacious, to an excess which surpasses even the usual measure of uncultivated society. (4)

The Uprising of 1857 shattered the Liberal/Utilitarian dream of building a rational replica of British society in India. Instead the English turned to theories of racial inferiority to explain the plight of Indians and their inability to realize the liberal-utilitarian dream. Racial superiority under the new slogan, "The White Man's Burden" then supplanted Liberal/Utilitarianism as the basis for the continuation of the Empire.

In the United States, Liberal utilitarianism and its optimistic world view found a hospitable home and was never tempered by a more tragic view of history which the British accepted after the sobering events of 1857. In America, the major tenets of of British Liberalism were reincarnated in the philosophy of Pragmatism. James, Dewey and the other Pragmatists retained the value of rationalism as the vehicle for human reform. Thanks to large doses of the newly discovered psychology and language taken from the new natural sciences, America had found itself a philosophy of individualism, law and economic growth which would validate liberalism and offer an alternative to the growing ideologies of class consciousness and cultural conflict in Europe. In no other American institution did the new philosophy of Pragmatism find such a welcome home as in education.

Modified by evolutionary social science of the late 19th century and blended into the philosophy of pragmatism in the early 20th century, the new philosophy espoused by

American educators, assumed that human beings are rational, economic growth is primary, individualism is the basis for the social order, and that evolutionary progress through inevitable stages of growth toward the "better life" is made possible through increasing consumer abundance which is the desirable and inevitable script for the future of the world. The reformers also retained the premise that the technological and economic determinants of history would eventually overwhelm and disolve so called "traditional cultures" and create a homogenious world which would replicate the modern west.

The influence of pragmatism, particularly as enunciated by John Dewey and his followers, has been enormous. With the growing emphasis on instrumental citizenship education as the major objective of schooling, the place of history and the humanities in the public schools and especially in teacher education has been seriously eroded. The past, which is the major concern of history, would have no significant role in creating the rational global community of the future and neither would the great variety of cultures and civilizations which make up the world outside Western industrial culture. Thus both a study of various civilizations and of history were of scant interest to the reformers who were influenced by Dewey. Students were to be taught to look to the future and to learn to cope with more pressing world problems such as population, world trade, ecological imbalance and food production and to play a role in bringing about a "better world." The role of culture, especially religion, was often presented as a source of needless conflict which eventually would be replaced by rationalism. This liberal, evolutionary, universalistic view of the world is not a philosophy which supports studying the past for its own sake or of studying Non-Western civilizations for their own truth and beauty. If history is to be included in the curriculum, it should serve to illustrate stages of desired social change and lend itself to an instrumental citizenship training, not as a humanistic enterprise in and of itself.

The majority of graduates of teacher training institutions have been socialized as positivists and evolutionists who believe technology will disolve all older values and usher in an increasingly economically interdependent and culturally homogenious world.

Education tends toward positivism as a method of scientific legitimacy for itself and as a consequence professional education clings to a system of research which emphasizes weighing, measuring and quantification. Ethnography, except in a few institutions such as the University of Pennsylvania, has been slow to gain acceptance in doctoral research in teacher education. Humanistic studies, except in history, are seldom choices for graduate research. In the few education courses dealing with the world outside the U.S. students are often taught that if people from various cultures just get together for face to face "rational" communication, they can solve many of the world's problems.

Many scholarly disciplines in the social sciences have modified the earlier assumptions of 19th century positivism. Anthropology has long eschewed the linear evolutionary approach. Under the influence of Franz Boas, American anthropologists by the 1920's had become wary of any generalizing statements about all people. Boas' students such as Benedict and Mead worked tirelessly to spread and popularize the idea of cultural relativism as well as to offer cultural models of human behavior which countered the dominant psychological models of the time. The structural-functionalists of the 1920's and '30's such as Malanowski and Radcliffe-Brown, extended cultural relativism and added the Structural-Functionalist theoretical framework for a new model of social analysis which saw religion, artistic expression, rites and values in every specific culture as being necessary to bind the social order together and to make its survival possible. The semioticists of our own time such as Douglas, Turner and Geertz have emphasized the importance of religion and other symbolic forms still further.

Despite the radically different approach offered by the Structural-Functionalists, the historians and other scholars who championed historical particularism, American education continued to hold to evolutionary models of historical and cultural analysis which denigrate traditional values, especially religion, and tended to see the contemporary west with its economic, secular, urban, legal framework as the model for all people everywhere. Now even the complex human area of morality has been reduced to an evolutionary model with Kohlberg's stages of development, the end result of which is to create humans who value personal autonomy so cherished by modern westerners. (5)

There are many reasons which might explain why the reforms in social science and history have made so little impact on education. Since the 1930's education has undergone constant professionalization and even the academic subjects taught in the schools have their own professional associations such as the NCSS. Since their founding these associations have become increasingly separated from academic departments and from professional organizations such as the American Historical Association and the American Philosophical Association. Furthermore, scholarly, discipline-based professional organizations have moved dramatically away from their earlier involvement in teaching and curriculum development and from teacher education in general. The result has been the unfortunate fossilizing of approaches to history, social science and humanities in the schools. Materials and approaches to history in the schools have changed little since the Progressive Period and the influence of Charles Beard.

The downgrading of the humanities in teacher education is also being caused by the rush to load education onto the bandwagon of the "new technology." The common assumption is that computers and new communication devices will bring everyone closer together and will somehow make learning less arduous and more compelling. Increased communication will either reveal the imagined "common humanity" of the world's people or communication itself will create a common core of world culture. An already heavy bias toward positivism and technology as the panaceas for educational ills is thus heightened in the present climate which tempts professional education into yet another easy answer to highly complex intellectual issues.

The new Global Education movement is the latest example of a long and continuing world view in American education. The Global education movement derives essentially from traditional American liberalism, 1950's modernization theory and is vaguely connected to Immanual Wallerstein's World Systems approach. The Global Education movement in its present form stresses more a <u>universalism</u> of civilization than the <u>particularism</u> offered by anthropology or the humanities. In addition, Global Education still tends to stress technological and economic factors as explanations of social change almost to the exclusion of cultural values, history and the other humanities.

Consequently, the new movement which one might expect would take other civilizations and particular cultures seriously may do just the opposite.

Instead of promoting the study of specific cultural areas and their various histories, many Global Educators advocate a generalized study of the world in its present form and in its future, presumably homogeneous state. Most Global educators present people as citizens of a Global system and they stress economic relationships and usually down-play any cultural differences which divide the human community. A leading exponent of Global Education offers a typical explanation why:

> The point is that today most human beings live out their lives in a cocoon of culture whose circumference equals the circumference of the globe. In a word there is a global culture. (6)

America's visions of rationalism and comsumerism are important factors in the socialization of American students. Few would argue the importance of giving American students an understanding of the liberal ideal which implies that to be human means to think rationally and to acquire property and consumer goods and to work to enable more and more people in the world to benefit from the advances of science and technology. However, is it necessary to put the civilizations outside Europe and American solely in the service of this socialization? By treating the great civilizations outside the west as undeveloped, lessor than, traditional, etc., we consciously or unconsciously demean their histories. Furthermore, we tend to treat these civilization as negative examples of what we Americans take to be proper values and social organization. In this context, Non-Western studies in the service of global education is ap extension of American Studies whose goal is the socialization of twentieth century American citizenship values.

Whether teachers call their courses Global Education, Area Studies or World History, most textbooks available to secondary students also use Non-Western studies to socialize a view of the world very similar to that of evolutionary positivism and reform liberalism. The exhaustive study of 306 textbooks conducted by the Asia Society in 1975 found that:

> 89 per cent (of the books) were either progress oriented, exalting the importance of novelty and denigrating tradition, or actually ethnocentric, measuring Asians by Western standards and emphasizing the role of Europeans and Americans in Asia.(7)

If we were to make serious efforts to Globalize American education through the Humanities, we must first transcend the dominant model of historical and social analysis that stresses technological-economic, evolutionary determinism and offers rationalisim as the sole characteristic of humaness. Instead of the liberal, secular, progressive model of a universal world culture, we must celebrate the the humanities, especially art, music, literature and history, because they focus on particular, not generalized civilization and aspects of culture.

The model for a humanistic approach to the world is similar to the cultural particularism advocated by the distinguished anthropologist Clifford Geertz. Geertz reminds us that "To be human is thus not to be everyman; it is to be a particular kind of man and of course men differ. `Other fields,' as the Javanese say, `Other grasshoppers.'" (8) Geertz emphasizes that we become human only as we are specifically integrated into a particular culture. This approach means that we can't loosely use the world human; we must talk about specific groups of humans such as Italians, Eskimos, Javanese, Indian, or Chinese. Each of these groups socializes its people in a particular way and that particular culture produces art, music, literature and other forms which at once replicate the cultural universe of that people and provide a model for future socialization of new members of the culture. Enabling us to take seriously the particular cultures and variations among Non-Western (sic) (9) civilizations of our global world could be the significant contribution of the humanities. As the late philosopher Charles Frankel reminds us:

> What images of human possibility will American society put before its members? What standards will it suggest to them as befitting the dignity of the human spirit? What decent balance among human employments will it exhibit? Will it speak to them only of success and celebrity and the quick fix that makes them happy, or will it find a place for grace, elegance, nobility and a sense of connection with the human adventure." (10)

The humanities can offer students some connection with the "The Human adventure" because they invite students to visit unfamiliar worlds through art, history, music and

philosophy. The humanities demand that we had better take individual cultural styles seriously. We cannot appreciate Bharat Natyam Dance, Noh Drama, Chinese opera or Benin bronzes without some understanding of the particular civilizations which produced each of them. We must know the cultural context that nurtured Koto music, Indian ragas, South Indian bronzes and Chinese landscape paintings; we cannot appreciate any of these products in isolation from the civilization which produced it. The humanities, like cultural anthropology, forces us to involve ourselves directly in other cultures and styles of civilization. This direct involvement prevents us from retreating into abstractions about some common world culture.

The humanities also pre-supposes a view of reality which is antithetical to positivism in social science, and which would question the liberal reform model of Pragmatism and the dominance of psychology in teacher education. The humanities honors the past for its own sake, views knowledge as broadening our human perspective rather than serving more immediate instrumental needs and always seeks out the human voice which is behind and animates technology, science and social structures. The humanities sees history as shaped by human consciousness and conceptualizes technology and economic structures as products of human creativity rather than as reified categories with lives and wills of their own.

However, while the humanities offers the greatest potential for studying cultural particularism, the cruel irony is that the humanities as they are now constituted is one of the most culture bound and parochial domains of western knowledge. Before the humanities can be used as a method to help globalize teacher education, they will have to be thoroughly re-conceptualized. As they now are taught, they probably increase the parochialism and western ethnocentricism of the students who study them seriously.

At a recent meeting of representatives from various scholarly disciplinary associations, called to discuss the incorporation of a global perspective within their respective fields, several speakers suggested special problems for the humanities. Michael Hooker of the American Philosophical Association stated that most departments are offering only Anglo-American philosophy with its approach of mathematical analytical

models. There are probably fewer than a dozen philosophy departments in the nation which offer any serious study of Non-Western philosophy. The case is similar in most English departments which dominate the teaching of literature. (11) These department's offerings are largely confined to the Anglophile world with an occasional selection from Russian, French or Italian. Even comparative literature departments seldom include material from China, India or Africa.

The centerpiece of the parochialism in the Humanities is the featured place of Greco-Roman civilization. Romantics of the 19th century such as Byron and Blake not only re-discovered the glory of Greece, they helped to manufacture it. Since that time, historians have used Greece, Rome and Western Europe as the model for all civilizations and the rest of the world has suffered in comparison. The Western Humanities are steeped in the art, literary and architectural forms of classical Greco-Roman civilization which constitute the basis of their aesthetic tastes. Architects look to Greek columns and Roman arches as the crucial supports for proper aesthetic styles, and literary criticism still follows Aristotle. Most Western humanists believe Shakespeare is the universal standard of literature; the Sanskrit playwright Kalidasa is at best the "Shakespeare of India". In most major American philosophy departments names like Radhakrishna, Confucius, Chu Hsi, Sankara and Han Fei Tzu hardly ever appear on a class syllabus; philosophy professors usually justify their omission by explaining, "You don't really mean to call that philosophy." In art history courses, a careful distinction between real art (western) and primitive or folk art is usually maintained. Only a few art history departments in the country regularly offer courses in Indian, Chinese and African art and those few institutions that do so seldom offer the artistic expression of these civilizations as part of the mainstream of the history of art. A similar treatment is true for the teaching of music.

One significant example of the parochialism of our approach to the humanities was evident in the much heralded 1969 Television series "Civilization" written and hosted by Kenneth Clark. Sir Kenneth began his series in Paris and ended it thirteen weeks later in London and New York. Not once in this survey of "Civilization" were viewers

invited to see anything from India, China, Africa or the Middle East. Dr. Clark, speaking for most Western Humanists, assumed that civilization is synonymous with Western Culture. Apparently viewers were to understand that civilization is not meant to include Chinese Landscapes, the Ajanta Caves or the wooden architectural style of Kyoto.

History, one of the major disclipines in the humanities, has played a dominant role in socializing parochialism. Historians since Herodotus have focused on either the histories of western nations or have constructed a world history which features Western civilization as a universal model and uses periodization which follows Western experience. Few American historians or authors of our college and secondary history texts would agree with Marshall G.S. Hodgson's position:

> Within this vast historical complex [Africa and Asia, Europe] Western Europe played a peripheral and till well into the Middle Ages a backward role...only in the High Middle Ages did Western Europeans begin truly to rise to the creative level of the core-areas of civilization (12)

In recent years only a few historians have attempted to construct a genuine world history. Of the three major world histories produced in the last twenty years, only McNeill's really devotes much attention to the contributions of the Non-West in the scheme of world history. McNeill's book, ironically titled The Rise of The West, (13) devotes many pages to Indian, Chinese and Middle Eastern world views and presents the distinct cultural styles developed in great civilizations from all over the world. Even so, The Rise of the West presents technology, particularly military technology, as the motivating source of human development and the engine of human social change, a World view compatible with Modern Western culture and a model which lends itself to a universal, technologically developed, world view. In the other two world histories, the Non-West plays no significant part at all. In the major college and high school texts the treatment of Non-Western civilization is similar. (14)

The majority of secondary and even college texts and teachers do not deal historically with the world beyond Europe. They collapse the histories of these civilizations into area studies and offer them as frozen time frames in history.

Millenia of Indian and Chinese History are often summed up in one chapter, and until the most recent texts, that chapter was included with the River Valley Civilizations of Mesopotamia and the Nile. The student is given the impression that India and China were nuclear civilizations on a par with Egypt and Sumer, but that these civilizations mysteriously vanished from view with the coming of Greece and Rome, and only re-appeared in the age of imperialism.

What passes for world history is really a Western oriented history with, at best, an addenda of Non-Western history. The impression left is that these civilizations were static and did not change over time and only the West had a continual, unbroken history worth studying. Even the Middle Ages are taken up in detail at the expense of the golden ages of the Guptas in India and the Tang and Sung in China - civilizations that far surpassed the west of that time in nearly every respect. The great rise of Islamic art, science and political administration is brushed aside from its rightful place in the history of the world. This is all the more misleading when the Renaissance is offered as the recovery of Classical Civilization and treated as if it were lost from human consciousness, without any recognition that the classical learning of Greece and Rome was alive and well in Islamic universities; that story is seldom told as part of "our" history of the world.

While the treatment of the Non-Western History is ethnocentric and misleading, Asian, African and Middle Eastern literature and philosophy and other areas of their humanities are almost non-*existent. Nectar in the Sieve and The Good Earth are sometimes included in a high school literature program, but the former is a novel about westernization and the later is an American woman's romanticized vision of a Chinese village. Only rarely might the music department play a recording of koto or sitar music, although the Beatles made some students flirt with the latter. Asian or African artistic and literary creations are merely add-ons or addenda without any real integration into the mainstream of human civilization.

We are living out an historical paradox which places two contradictory trends before us. One road paved with technology and economic interdependence is taking all

of us toward a world of homogeneity and interdependence. The other road, paved with culture-specific values and primordial loyalties, is leading us into greater sub-divisions based on particularistic cultural meanings and values.

Clearly there is a move in the world toward economic inter-dependence. American music and blue jeans can be found all around the Globe. Some forms of Yoga are as familiar here as in India. But the facile statements such as "We are all human," or "We all want the same things in life," may not only be irrelevant but dangerous. The oversimplification of life which reduces humans to the role of producers and consumers of economic goods is one of the great temptations to those trying to make sense out of an increasingly culturally complex world. However, as trade and travel increase and bring individuals into contact with other individuals all over the globe, the urge for cultural identification and the drive for survival of one's religious and linguistic group appears to grow stronger.

Catholics and Protestants are killing each other in Northern Ireland; in Iran the Bahais are being systematically slaughtered; the Sikhs' desire for a Khalastan has cost India thousands of innocent lives, and the life of its Prime Minister. Jews and Arabs do not recognize they are cultural cousins and they relate to one another in hatred; whites in South Africa think their black citizens are less civilized; the French speaking of Canada and the Spanish speakers of New York vociferously insist on maintaining their languages and cultures, and fundamentalist Christians in America would legislate their own values into universal law if they could. Even in the "rational" West there is no single transcendent value around which all nations and cultural groups can rally. How much more diverse is the real world in which we live.

Clifford Geertz celebrates this seeming paradox in modern life. He reminds us that at the same time that the world is becoming more economically interrelated, it is also becoming more primordial. (15) Primordial means that every cultural group fights to preserve its unique identity of race, language, religion and customs. Celebrating the paradox, we should not have to choose between universalism or cultural particularlism; we need to integrate both models into our world view. Of course we need to study the

shrinking of the world, brought closer through communication, trade and travel, but at the same time we also need to teach about the unique cultural styles and values which give all of us personal identity and meaning in an increasingly alienating world.

And it is the humanities which might bridge the gap between these two dimensions of modern life. The humanities consider similar fields of scholarship around the world, but they present unique creations in each field. In addition, it is the mission of the humanities to see the human behind often reified concepts like modernization, technology and complex organizations. The humanities in schools, and especially in teacher training institutions, must go back to its basic understanding of itself and its vision of reality: the humanly created world. If this can be done, the humanities can serve in a creative adversarial role to the growing assumption that technology and economic interdependence is rapidly transforming the world into a great market place where idiocyncratic cultural styles are becoming not only obsolete, but even obstacles to the on-coming global world which the modernizers so desperately wish.

In an increasingly pluralistic world the humanities could broaden Global Education because it would set a humanistic, particularistic paradigm along-side a model of economic and technological determinism. Humanities is at its best in the concrete; it sticks our nose in differences and won't let us retreat behind superficial and abstract statements of a "common world culture". Humanities evoke immediate and emotional responses and help us see specific meanings in larger abstractions. When we hear a koto we know it is not a violin or guitar. When we see an Ardhanarisvara, we can't convert it into something we are familiar with like our uni-sex advertisements; we must confront a new reality. Literature gives us flesh and blood portraits of differing people with different values and we can't escape that reality with cliches like we are all human. By confronting unique aesthetic experiences, we are forced to recognize that Japanese, Indians and Nigerians actually do think and feel differently than we do. In the words of the 1980 Commission on the Humanities:

> Finally, though slowly, the meaning of cosmopolitanism has broadened, and with it the idea of citizenship. We cannot afford to look parochially at other cultures as

curiosities. "like us" only insofar as their members have converted to Christianity or studied at Oxford or Yale. (16)

The Humanities would also present to students the vivid reality that the interdependent world market system is not always benign. Those advocating the new global economic system often see it as free from exploitation. However, tragedy and conflict are still a part of this world system. Literature such as Achebe's Things Fall Apart can help students understand that even in globalism, powerless people suffer and their lives are disrupted. Certainly Guernica demonstrates one type of global interchange, as does Hiroshima Notes, Kanthapura and Jewel in the Crown.

If the humanities and their approach to the world were to be taken seriously in American education, then civilization and its humanistic creations can no longer be seen as imprisoned by the borders of Western culture. To break out of this mind-set, a genuine attempt would have to be made to include the humanities in the schools. In studying the history of the world, all major civilizations should be developed chronologically so student realize that civilizations outside the west have a history and civilization that are worth studying. Concepts such as ancient, medieval and modern should be replaced by periodization which takes into account the various centers of civilization. The spot light shining on the Golden Ages of World History shifts from Egypt to Greece and Rome and then to the Mauryan, Han and Gupta dynasties. During the European "Dark Ages", it shines on the Tang and Sung of China and on the great expanse of Islamic civilization as well as on the flowering of the West African kingdoms. This type of world history should be required of all potential teachers.

The process of introducing this kind of approach to world history, and the inclusion of Non-Western humanities in the school curriculum, has not become a reality in the curricula in most teacher training institutions. Most graduates of these institutions have had no systematic training in non-western languages, history or literature and there is little prospect that this will change. In most history departments, there is presently insufficient personnel to offer Non-Western History, and with the hiring freeze and the propensity to fill the few existing vacancies with professors who can teach the new

technologies, there is little hope that those who can teach Asian and African art, literature, language and history will be hired in colleges of education in the foreseeable future. What can be done to break the vicious cycle of western ethnocentricism?

Although it is doubtful that institutions of teacher education presently have the faculty who could take such an approach to world civilization and the humanities, other resources are available. Often the large research universities house NDEA Area studies centers specializing in the languages and culture of South and East Asia, The Middle East, Latin American, the Soviet Union and Africa. All of these NDEA centers are required by federal law to devote a part of their budgets to so-called "Outreach" activities. These Centers could make a very practical and long-lasting contribution by taking responsibility for aspects of the world history course offered to students in teacher education programs. Unfortunately, at this time the NDEA centers have little articulation with colleges of education even those within the same university. Crossing the street that separates Schools of Education and the Area Centers would be one concrete and useful step that many teacher training colleges could take immediately.

For the smaller colleges of education which are not in proximity to NDEA centers, the opportunity still remains to forge linkages with these Area Studies Centers. The centers are spread all over the nation. Small teacher training schools could form alliances with the Centers and request the Center personnel to travel to the teachers' colleges to offer courses or parts of courses. Creative scheduling such as Friday-to-Sunday courses several times a year might facilitate this type of cooperation. Professors in colleges of education could also be offered seminars with professors from the Area Studies Centers.

If the large integrated world civilization course cannot be mandated for students who will become teachers, the next best option would be to require every student in a teacher-training program to take at least two courses in Non-western humanities. In large universities this could be easily accomplished by drawing upon the existing offerings in departments of music, art, anthropology, history and comparative literature. Most universities offer at least a few such courses and some of them could be required

of all potential teachers. For those enrolled in teacher training institutions not part of a large university system, the same relationship can be forged with nearby larger universities which can and will gladly supply visiting scholars in various non-western humanities to teach courses or parts of courses.

Another solution to help alleviate the absence of existing personnel in of teacher education and the parochialism of approach in those institutions would be for teacher training colleges to hire some of the young scholars who have been trained in Non-western humanities and area studies but who are not able to get teaching jobs at the university level in the areas of their specialization. There are competent young scholars ready to work in Indian languages and literature, Chinese history and philosophy, Arabic literature, Latin American culture and many other fields of Non-Western humanities. Hiring these individuals in teacher training colleges would demonstrate a beginning commitment to non-western humanities and would add a dimension in teacher education not previously experienced. It would be an adventure for both the young scholars and the type of faculties that presently dominate most teacher training institutions.

American universities have more faculty who know more about more cultures and the humanistic creations of these cultures than perhaps any other country of the world. In many cases these scholars are only a block or two away from the teacher training centers. Yet paradoxically these experts are seldom called upon by professional educators. An alliance, which admittedly will initially be difficult, must be forged between the area studies specialists and professors of education if future teachers are to have the humanistic education they will require if they are to pass on a more realistic world view than the one which now dominates American teaching.

Because department and program organization and structure in teachers colleges is generally more flexible than in liberal arts colleges, there is a great possibility of creating new configurations for courses and teaching. The common foundations, usually required of all students, such as philosophy and history, could easily become more comparative and incorporate materials and paradigms from China, India, Japan and Africa. Alternate models of education and philosophy could help stretch our

understanding of education and teaching. Even in educational sociology and psychology, bastions of western ethnocentricism, material on stratification, the self, personality and development could just as easily be chosen from cultures outside the west and these case studies would broaden both future teachers and the disclipines themselves. In methods courses, systems of socialization and teaching used in other civilizations such as the guru-shishya system of India or the relationship between Zen master and pupil in Japan could be considered by future teachers as possible models. The inclusion of Non-Western materials, case studies and paradigms could similarly be incorporated in the teaching of English, Bilingual education, mathematics and art education. If the present faculty is not competent to teach such materials, team teaching with collegues from the Area Studies Centers or disclipinary departments could be arranged to mutual advantage.

Students who graduate from teacher training institutions must feel comfortable in dealing with non-western material. This means we must introduce humanities education into teacher training institutions and then insist that a culturally pluralistic curriculum be the context for those offerings. " The Cloud Messenger" has to be required along with "Hamlet". Tu Fu and Li Po have to be taught along side Blake and Byron. Chartes has to be compared to Meenakshi. The Acropolis and Ajanta should stand aesthetically side by side. Cheever and Mishima must both be read and Subalaxmi and Beverly Sills must both be heard. Once this kind of knowledge is required for teacher education, future teachers can escape and avoid the cliches and sentimental approaches to Non-western civilization that presently abound in our textbooks and classrooms. Arduous and difficult as learning non-western humanities may be, the rewards are immense. In examining how other peoples have faced and celebrated the human condition, we become more fully human ourselves. In so doing we may lose some of our smug certainty that the future of the world is destined to become an extension of our own materialistic, technological culture.

Perhaps the most significant value of a world Humanities approach would be to place before our students alternate paradigms of civilization. If the world of the future is to be richer in meaning, our students should have more choices available. Maybe the

centuries of effort that the Chinese have invested in human relations, the millenia of collective wisdom the Indians have amassed on the inner self and the vast experience the West African tradition offers of more politically active roles for women, all could enrich our own lives.

Louis Dumont, a scholar who has spent most of his life studying India, suggests that we are facing a crisis of modern Western ideology. (17) Since that crisis involves the very way we think, it is particularly difficult for us to define the crisis. However, Dumont tells us, "to isolate our ideology is a sine qua non for transcending it, simply because otherwise we remain caught within it as the very medium of our thought." One way out of this dilemma, Dumont suggests, is to attempt a comparative approach, to imagine the perspective of a radically different culture and use it to look back on our own.

Dumont argues that modern western ideology is unique. It differs not only from Indian culture but from all other cultures including our own historic tradition. What Dumont calls this aberrant worldview, which we so casually take for granted as natural, is an economic view of human history. This economic ideology makes the relation of the isolated individual and nature primary and builds up the concepts of society and culture from that. Most other societies take society and relations among individuals as primary and derive concepts of economics and individualism from them. Dumont questions whether it is not the modern west which is out of step with the world. He forces us at least to recognize that our identification of humanness in economic terms - Homoeconomicus - means we are creating models of humanity based on our unique categories of value and are not implicit in the "nature of things".

Part of our teaching and learning always has to be an awareness of the very categories we think in. That is education in its deepest sense. Philosophy, history, the concept of civilization itself, are all terms created by humans. They are subject to amendment and change by human beings. By including the humanistic traditions outside the West in our teacher education, not as an add-on but as a source of questions and answers perhaps fundamentally different from our own Western tradition, we teach

critical thinking not only about specific civilizations, but about the nature of our own thought patterns and value systems. We make it possible for students to understand and question the very disclipines in which we are engaged. The comparative approach has to be a part of American education and the humanities can lead the way if we take both the humanities and Non-Western civilizations seriously.

---

(1) Report of The Commission on the Humanities, The Humanities in American Life, 1980. Bennett, William J., To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education, 1985.
(2) Wallerstein, Immanuel, The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European Economy in the Sixteenth Century, 1974.
(3) Quoted in Metcalf, Thomas, Ed., Modern India, p. 161.
(4) As quoted in Edwardes, Michael, Rai, pp. 74-75
(5) Kohlberg, Lawrence, The Philosophy of Moral Development, 1981. See also Gilligan, Carol, In A Different Voice for criticism of Kohlberg.
(6) Anderson, Lee, Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age, p. 268.
(7) Asia Society, Asia in American Textbooks, 1975.
(8) Geertz, Clifford, The Interpretation of Cultures, p. 53.
(9) "Non-west" is symbolic of our problem of discourse about civilizations outside the west. The term assumes a Western basis for civilization and socializes the very values this paper is attempting to ameliorate
(10) Frankel, Charles, As quoted in Beyond Expertise, p. 1.
(11) Council On Learning, The Role of The Scholarly Disclipines, p. 23.
(12) Hodgson, Marshall, G.S., "The Inter-relations of Societies in History," Comparative Studies in Society and History, January, 1963, p. 248.
(13) McNeil, William, The Rise of The West.
(14) See for example, Wallbank, T. Walter and Schrier, Arnold, Living World History, 1982.
(15) Geertz, Op. Cit. pp. 255-31i
(16) Humanities In American Life, p. 1i.
(17) Dumont, Louis, From Mandeville to Marx